

SURVEY OF ODP FUNCTIONS AND MANPOWER

Prepared for
Director, Office of Data Processing
November, 1978

By:

Ad Hoc Task Force in ODP
Manpower Allocation

STATINTL

Chairman




Background

Consistent with an Agency-wide reduction of personnel slots effective at the beginning of Fiscal Year 1979, the Office of Data Processing was forced to accept a reduction of 15 slots in FY 79. An additional reduction of 5 slots was levied upon the Office for FY 80. The loss of the FY 80 slots represented a real loss of strength, but the FY 79 slots were perfectly offset by previously obtained program approval for an increase of 15 slots in FY 79. But whether the personnel cuts represented real losses or whether they took the form of denied fulfillment of additional staffing requirements, an objective analysis of ODP manpower utilization was called for to insure that the impact of the personnel cuts would be minimized. Therefore, Mr. Clifford D. May, Jr. Director of Data Processing, appointed an ad hoc task force to survey the functions and activities of the Office, prioritize them, and prepare recommendations for the allocation of ODP manpower resources against those prioritized functions and activities. The task force was instructed to not attempt wholesale office reorganization. The members of the task force were:

rman

STATINTL

Subsequent to the establishment of the task force, the Director of Data Processing assigned an additional task to it. This task was an assignment to respond to the issues raised in a review of administrative support functions which was performed by  Deputy Chief of the Administrative Staff.

STATINTL

Findings

In general, the Office is not unduly suffering from a lack of personnel slots. (This is not to say that the Office is not feeling the effects of vacancies within the authorized personnel ceiling). The task force has identified a few functions which require initial staffing or modest increases in staffing. But overall, the Office has an adequate authorized staffing level to permit it to fulfill its mission in FY 79.

With some caveats (in no particular order):

First, Applications can use more people. But then Applications can almost always use more people. For at least the last four years, Applications has been faced with more requests for work than could be handled by existing resources. Currently they are committed to some 65 man years of work which is in process. In addition, there is always a queue of over 50 work orders for which estimates to complete have not even been determined. The existence of this queue, or "backlog", does not necessarily mean that more programmers should be rushed into Applications and put to work. If additional delay in delivering systems to customers was judged to be an acceptable price to pay to gain people to reapply elsewhere in the office, some Applications development people could be reassigned and presumably the queue would lengthen. But, returning to the original point, Applications could use more slots.

Second, the effort expended by the Management Staff in reviewing ADP procurement actions to comply with [REDACTED] may be another somewhat elastic activity. That is, the task can be sized to fit the manpower available to perform the task. We believe that the task is important but that no more than the current three positions should be devoted to this activity.

Third, we cannot access the future impact of the policy to permit only one hire against two government job vacancies. This policy may affect our ability to even reach the ODP authorized staffing strength.

And finally, there are some as yet unknown potential requirements for staffing -- records management and an accountable property inventory and control system. These

functions may generate needs for staffing which we cannot now foretell. Nevertheless, the functions are important and do require support. We therefore offer our best estimates of initial staffing requirements in succeeding sections of this report.

The output of the task force is presented in the form of a series of recommendations followed by a tabular list of functions and corresponding recommended changes in staffing levels. The task force made no attempt to produce a list of functions and assign numerical priorities from 1 to n. Rather, the task force chose to establish three classes of priority: mandatory, desirable, and expendable. Each of the identifiable functions was then assigned to the priority class deemed to be most appropriate and any recommended change of staffing level was noted. Such a scheme produces some apparent anomalies, such as a function being judged expendable but receiving no recommended cuts from current staffing levels, or a function being judged as being mandatory yet receiving a proposed reduction in strength. But the task force believes the method to be more informative and more useful in exercises of this nature. One last note. The assignment to respond to the administrative support issues raised by [REDACTED] has not been treated as a separate topic in this report. Administrative support functions were reviewed as they surfaced any place in the organization.

STATINTL

Summary of Recommendations

1. Provide a position for an additional Security Officer. Assign the technical Security Officer to the Management Staff. Assign the area Security Officer to the Administrative Staff. *Discuss with Ron L.*
2. Assign responsibility for system access control to the Area Security Officer.
3. Assign the accounting responsibility Finance Officers to the Administrative Staff. Eliminate one Finance Officer position and reassign the other to the Administrative Staff.
4. Overhaul the PAR System.
5. Establish an Advanced Planning and Projects Staff.
6. Improve the effectiveness of the Office Registry and officially assign the function of records management to it.
7. Establish an accountable property inventory and control function. Assign two positions to the Administrative Staff to support this function.
8. Reduce CIA staff positions in CSPO to twenty-one positions.
9. Reduce staff employee support to CAMS in favor of contractor support.
10. Transfer technical writing and technical library staffing and function from the Support Staff to the Customer Services Staff.
11. Transfer the Processing Support Staff position devoted to teleprocessing support to the Teleprocessing Branch, Engineering Division.
12. Further reduce the Processing Support Staff to two positions. *To 2, or by 2? (See page 9)*

13. Transfer operator training responsibilities from the Customer Services Staff to the technicians in Operations Division.
14. Add two positions to Customer Services Staff to enhance consulting services for the benefit of ODP users.
15. Eliminate excessive supervisory positions in the Ruffing Center by eliminating the position of Deputy Chief, the two team leader positions, and the chief technician position.
16. Eliminate one technician position in the Ruffing Center.
17. Eliminate the Administrative position in the Ruffing Center.
18. Assign two additional staff positions to Engineering Division to replace IBM contractors.
19. Assign an additional position to Production Division for automated message processing support and to provide an interface with CDS.
20. Assign an additional position to Production Division to support PERSIGN.
21. Transfer the COMTEN Software support function from Engineering Division to Systems Programming Division.
22. Assign one additional position to Systems Programming Division to provide system programming support for the intelligent terminal.
23. Assign one additional position to Systems Programming Division to support mini-computer developments.
24. Assign one additional position to Systems Programming Division to support GIMS.

Recommendations

No attempt is made here to present the recommendations in any sort of priority order. As closely as possible, the recommendations will be offered in an order approximating a review of the Office beginning with the Office of the Director (no recommendation) and proceeding through the Management Staff, Administrative Staff, Consolidated SAFE Project Office, Applications, and Processing. However, some recommendations affect more than one Office component which disturbs the logical presentation somewhat and tends to introduce some redundancy.

Recommendation Number 1 - Provide a slot for an additional security officer. Keep one security officer in the Management Staff with responsibility for technical security. Assign the other security officer to the Administrative Staff with responsibility for area security.

Comment - At the time of the Office reorganization in 1976, the security officer was placed in the Management Staff with the intent of allowing him to concentrate on technical security policy and issues. But no matter where the security officer is organizationally placed, he seems to get bogged down in what we call area security - clearance actions, security violations, compartmented clearances, etc. Providing a second security officer should keep one security officer free to concentrate on technical security. However, we fear that collocating two security officers would ultimately result in two security officers devoting almost full time to area security. Hence the proposal to assign one officer to MS and the other to AS.

Recommendation Number 2 - The security officer with responsibility for area security should assume responsibility for administering system access control be it the dispensing of user identifications, system passwords (GIMS, VM, ?) or the possible future task of establishing user access profiles for an access control facility.

Comment - In years past, the ODP Security Officer was responsible for managing system access information. He approved user identifications (USERIDS) and handed out passwords. The task was delegated to system administrators to streamline the processing necessary to grant a user access to a system. In an era of heightened awareness of security

vulnerabilities and concentration on improved security methods and procedures, the control of system access should be centralized and returned to the Area Security Officer. This is a traditional Security Officer function related to personnel security clearances and compartmented accesses.

Recommendation Number 3 - The finance officers should be placed in the Administrative Staff. Furthermore, in so doing, one finance officer slot should be eliminated.

25X1A

Comment - The finance officers were placed in the Management Staff in the Office reorganization of 1976. It was envisioned that they would take an active role in budget preparation and control. This role has not materialized. The function supported by the finance officers remains an administrative function and should be returned to the Administrative Staff. And since travel and training funds are now administered from the Office of the Deputy Chief, Administrative Staff, one slot encumbered by a finance officer can better be used for some other purpose.

Recommendation Number 4 - The PAR (Project Activity Report) system should be overhauled to improve accuracy and credibility of the report and to automate production of the report.

(MS)

Comment - Currently the PAR provides the data which is fundamental to the system established to enable the EAG to exercise some authority over the disposition of ADP resources in the Agency. Until and/or unless a better alternative is produced, it will remain the source of that data and therefore will continue to be a vital element in the EAG ADP review process. The PAR needs attention. The software which produces the PAR was developed piecemeal over the course of a number of years. It is inefficient and inflexible and does not lend itself to easy updating. Largely because of the limitations of the software, PAR production requires the full time support of at least one individual in Engineering Division. Furthermore, the PAR has received criticism for perceived inaccuracies in its data - criticism which may or may not be well founded. In any case, the Management Staff is the primary customer for the PAR. Therefore the Management Staff should document requirements for the PAR or develop requirements for an improved PAR and present the requirements via a form 930

MS -
Dec '79 target

to Applications for development of a new PAR system. The system should be developed such that Production Division can assume responsibility for PAR production.

Recommendation Number 5 - Establish an Advanced Planning (and Projects) Staff.

Technology * - No
MS

Comment - The Director of Data Processing needs a Chief, Scientific Advisor, or a Chief Planner or a Chief technical Architect - call it what you will. This individual must not be encumbered with managerial responsibility and must not be bogged down with the sort of bureaucratic exercises which commonly assail the Management Staff from all sides. The position must be autonomous and the incumbent should report directly to and only to the Director of Data Processing. The position should be filled by an individual of unassailable technical qualifications. The individual would become the architect of the future for this office. The position is obviously extremely sensitive with uncommon potential for major impact - good or bad - on the Office.

The creation of a staff is an act of beneficence. The task force believes that the Chief Scientific Advisor should be given secretarial support and the long range planning function and personnel slot should be moved from the Management Staff to this staff.

Recommendation Number 6 - The Office should develop an effective, well-operated registry. The registry should be given the current total of two positions and should provide a records management capability.

Comment - The Office should request expert assistance from outside the Office to help set up an effective registry. We should carefully evaluate and consider implementing constructive recommendations of the outside expert.

Recommendation Number 7 - Establish and support an accountable property inventory and control function in the Administrative Staff.

Comment - There is a task force from the Office of Logistics which is attempting to perform an inventory and set up a control system to maintain control of ODP accountable property in compliance with [REDACTED]. We have seen a memorandum for the record generated by the task force which recommends a staffing complement of five positions for on-going support

ILLEGIB

Approved For Release 2001/07/13 : CIA-RDP84-00933R000200230017-9

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2001/07/13 : CIA-RDP84-00933R000200230017-9

Recommendation Number 18 - Engineering Division should be given two additional slots to replace the [REDACTED] contractors who provide a systems performance measurement capability.

25X1A

Comment - The [REDACTED] contractors engaged in performance measurement activity produce data and analyses which are basic input to the development of Processing plans. Such a sensitive activity should not be entrusted to contractors, particularly representatives from one of ODP's major vendors. A less desirable alternative for supporting this function is to contract with a company who does not provide hardware or software to ODP.

*Effect on
Contract?*

Recommendation Number 19 - An additional position should be given to Production Division for automated message processing support and to provide an interface to the cable dissemination system.

Comment - Experience to date with CDS/FAMPS/AMPS/ETAR justifies a position to support automated message processing.

Recommendation Number 20 - An additional position should be given to Production Division for PERSIGN.

Comment - Based on past experience with large complex systems such as GAS, PERSIGN will require an additional position in Production Division for production processing support.

Recommendation Number 21 - Responsibility for COMTEN software support should be transferred from Engineering Division to Systems Programming Division.

Comment - Systems Programming Division should be responsible for all system software support. This proposal does not suggest transferring slots or individuals from Engineering Division to Systems Programming Division.

*Person?
(Is this consistent w/ #11 on p.9?)*

Recommendation Number 22 - Systems Programming Division should be given one additional slot to provide system programming support for the new intelligent terminal.

Comment - The task force is unable to predict the magnitude of the effort which will be required to provide system software support for the new terminals. But the users are going to need some tools to help them exploit the capabilities of the new device. One position should be added to Systems Programming Division to provide an initial capability.

*3PD or ED?
(Note #11 on p.9)*

Recommendation Number 23 - Systems Programming Division should be given one additional slot to support mini-computer developments in the office.


Comment - The ODP Board of Directors recommended office support for mini-computer projects almost one year ago. That support is still required.

Recommendation Number 24 - Assign an additional position to Systems Programming Division to provide a development position for new GIMS system programmers.

Comment - Remembering past experiences when we allowed the number of systems programmers supporting GIMS to fall too low to provide adequate support, we must provide a position from which trainees can be developed to support GIMS.

Recommendations for FY 80

ODP has been asked to take a cut of five personnel slots in FY 80. Although priorities may change with the passage of time, the task force recommends that the reduction of five slots be accommodated in the following manner:

- o Eliminate the position which provides operator support for the DAC in 4F50. *who?* *Person?*
- o Eliminate the technical writer position. Rely upon technical writing support from contractors who are already in place. 
- o Eliminate three of the positions from Applications LEGIB which are used to support applications development. Presumably the impact of implementing this recommendation will be manifested as a longer queue of requests awaiting action.

Presentation of Data

The remaining sections of this report present supporting data or summaries of data. The sections include a summary of recommended staffing actions, a list of expendable functions, a list of desirable functions, and a list of functions performed in ODP.

The section, "Summary of Recommended Staffing Actions," is a tabular presentation of recommended changes to authorize personnel ceilings for office components.

As previously mentioned, office functions were assigned to one of three priority classes. The priority classes were given numbers with priority 1 denoting mandatory functions, priority 2 desirable functions, and priority 3 indicating expendable functions. We provided separate lists of both the expendable functions and the desirable functions which are titled accordingly. All other functions are mandatory functions. Since the bulk of office functions fall into the mandatory category, no separate list of priority 1 functions was prepared.

The final section of the report is a list of functions as defined by the task team. It is not intended to be exhaustively detailed, but the list provides a good overview of how the Office personnel resources are deployed. In some cases, a function is listed as having an authorized ceiling given in fractions of personnel slots. This of course is nonsense, but it represents our attempt to reconcile efforts required to perform each function with the resources available to perform the function. We think the artificiality introduced is more than offset by the value of the information that is conveyed.